

From: Buddy Ortale
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB, jadelst@fcc.gov
Date: Tue, Feb 11.2003 3:19 PM
Subject: Triennial Review

While I know you are in the 11th hour, I just wanted to remind each and everyone of you that the Telecom Act of 1996 has been and continues to be good for consumers. The Act is very clear (both explicit and implicit). Do not let politics (i.e.. pressure from those such as Billy Tauzin who are on the take from the Bells' for big money) decide this. The 96 Act is clear and it is incumbent upon you the commissioners' to uphold the law that Congress signed.

Doing the right thing is not necessarily the easy thing...especially in the face of political pressure. But these Bells' have operated as monopolies long enough...with very little innovation and imagination, and have done everything possible to get around this...including their greatest weapon...STRATEGIC INCOMPETENCE!! UNE's, including switching at telric pricing are what the Act demanded. Do what Congress intended and don't bow to pressure!

Sincerely,

Buddy Ortale

From: Angela Bingham
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Tue. Feb 11, 2003 1:00 PM
Subject: UNE Platform

<<UNE-Platform Letter Kathleen Abernathy.doc>>

Thanks,

Angie Bingham
AccessOne Inc.
820 W. Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60607
3124419950
312441 1010 fax

From: Lisa Bozarth
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 6:44 PM
Subject: UNE - Platform

Please see attached **letter**.

Thank you,

Lisa Bozarth
Executive Sales Assistant

Access One Incorporated
820 **W** Jackson Boulevard
6th Floor
Chicago, IL 60607
312.441.1000
312.441.1010 fax

w.accessoneinc.com

From: Rick Gamber
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 4:12 PM
Subject: UNE-P Comments

Commissioner Abernathy:

Attached as a word document are our comments regarding the current review of UNE-P policies.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rick Gamber
Michigan Consumer Federation

From: Robert Smith
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 1:03 PM
Subject: Triennial Review

Commissioner Abernathy:

Please continue to support linesharing. **As** a Covad shareholder it is important for me to remind you of the money and effort expended by facilities-based CLEC's like Covad to create a business which helps to offer broadband access to an ever increasing number of people.

Please do not give in to the monopolistic BOCs and take away our mandated right to offer DSL over shared lines at a reasonable cost.

Thank you

Robert Smith

From: Sarah Castor
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 12:59 PM
Subject: Competitive Telecom

Commissioner Abernathy:

Please KEEP LINESHARING INTACT. It is imperative that competition not be cut off now, giving us, the consumer, choices at Competitive rates.

Thank you so much,

Sarah Castor

Sarah M. Castor
Strictly Commercial, Inc
221 NE Ivanhoe Blvd.
Suite 330
Orlando, FL 32804
407.648.0330 Ofc.
407.422.1273 Fax

w.strictlycommercial.com

Serving the office community in Central Florida for 13 years as an exclusive representative of the tenant's needs.

From: Mark Buse
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 6:36 PM
Subject: RBOCs monopolize even when CLECs and ISPs pay RETAIL

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

The evidence is clear that RBOC claims of injury due to UNE sales are utterly false & baseless. RBOCs have complained and obstructed even when CLECs and ISPs pay retail for local access services. The RBOCs have shown that they will do anything to destroy competition not only for local access, but for all higher-level non-monopoly services as well.

How can you explain the persistent market control of the RBOCs if not through their monopolistic, anti-competitive behaviors:

1. sabotaging phone number portability to make switching to CLECs much more difficult for customers
2. sabotaging interconnects with CLECs so that customers switching to CLECs would still have good local phone connectivity
3. sabotaging roll-outs of data services even when the CLECs were paying RETAIL(!!!) prices for local & regional data services like Frame Relay and ATM
- 4 sabotaging installations for ISPs that use RBOC DSL at retail prices--which we have experienced numerous times as a business consumer of those services

The whole notion of defending the RBOCs for their destructive approach to business is ridiculous.

Then for you and others to suggest that CLECs and Wall Street were to blame for industry problems is adding insult to injury

Wall Street removed its support after 3 years of CLEC and ISP build-out efforts when it became clear by 1999 that the federal government would not bother to enforce the 1996 Telecom Act and that the RBOCs could violate it with impunity. Once a firm could work through the regulatory process to prove RBOC abuse, they would be fined only \$1M, a pittance compared with the business they retained through their monopolistic behavior. As customers Of various entities that were destroyed by the RBOCs, we directly witnessed the obstruction of the RBOCs, and their subsequent direct solicitation of our business. It was sickening!

As an investor, I avoid losing situations regardless of cause. That is what Wall Street did AFTER the RBOCs showed they would stop at nothing to destroy even the prospect of competition. That is the same thing that happens when investors pull money out of other nations when there are political upheavals that are likely to be anti-business.

The answer is further divestiture of all local infrastructure, not retrenchment of RBOC monopolies.

I respectfully request that you or your staff respond to my written comments regarding your proposals to undermine the 1996 Telecom Act and entrench the RBOC monopolies. The vigorous public opposition to your actions must be included in the public record for this matter.

Regards,
Mark Buse
Managing Partner
iLaunch Ventures, LLC - Management Consultants
3600 Smith Avenue, **Ste** 2600
Everett, **WA** 98201-4544
866.launch.8
Mark.Buse@iLaunchVentures.com

CC: Mark Buse, vice.president@whitehouse.gov

From: Maxbenjam@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 8:30 AM
Subject: PLEASE GIVE ME MORE LOCAL PHONE SERVICE COMPETITION

Commissioner Powell,

I live in Brooklyn, New York, a fair sized burg of some 2 million people, part of the larger entity New York City (pop. 8 million +). I AM A VICTIM OF VERIZON'S HORRIBLE HORRIBLE SERVICE (OUTRAGEOUS RATES (\$47/mo. for local phone use), BAD/NONEXISTENT CUSTOMER SERVICE). .AND I HAVE LITTLE/NO CHOICE.

This strikes me as decidedly un-American. Verizon doesis doing what any Monopolist will do- no competition = do the minimum you need to do for service. charge the highest rates tenable, make big fat profits.

Where is the competition?

Bring back the Old AT&T- at least they were highly regulated. My monthly phone service is costing me more than I can remember.

I implore you kind sir, please use the wisdom and weight of your office to bring LOCAL PHONE SERVICE COMPETITION to my little town, and to the rest of our great nation.

respectfully,

Max Benjamin
249 6th Avenue
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11215

From: Buddy Ortale
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 3:27 PM
Subject: Fw: Triennial Review

Please see below message

----- Original Message -----

From: Buddy Ortale

To: mpowell@fcc.gov; kabernat@fcc.gov; mcopps@fcc.gov; kjmweb@fcc.gov; jadelst@fcc.gov

Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2003 2:24 PM

Subject: Triennial Review

While I know you are in the 11th hour, I just wanted to remind each and everyone of you that **the** Telecom Act of 1996 has been and continues to be good for consumers. The Act is very clear (both explicit and implicit). Do not let politics (i.e., pressure from those such as Billy Tauzin who are on the take from the Bells' for big money) decide this. The 96 Act is clear and it is incumbent upon you the commissioners' to uphold the law that Congress signed.

Doing the right thing **is** not necessarily the easy thing...especially in the face of political pressure. But these Bells' have operated as monopolies long enough...with very little innovation and imagination, and have done everything possible to get around this.. including their greatest weapon...STRATEGIC INCOMPETENCE!! UNE's, including switching at telric pricing are what the Act demanded. Do what Congress intended and don't bow to pressure!

Sincerely,

Buddy Ortale

From: c gengler
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 10:18 AM
Subject: Please keep linesharing

I am shocked to hear rumors that the FCC is strongly considering elimination of linesharing. I am a Professor of Marketing at the largest business school in the country (Baruch College in New York City), and I can guarantee you this **will** set broadband access back, not forward. It will, however, increase profit margins for the RBOCs.

- 1) Eliminating linesharing will increase prices. The RBOCs have not hidden their intent to raise prices as soon as possible.
- 2) Price is THE MAIN BARRIER to getting broadband to the majority of homes in the U.S.A.
- 3) Eliminating linesharing will therefore slow growth of broadband.

PLEASE FIGHT HARD TO KEEP LINESHARING.

Sincerely,
Charles Gengler, PhD
Professor of Marketing
Baruch College
New York City

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Shopping - Send Flowers for Valentine's Day
<http://shopping.yahoo.com>

From: c gengler
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Feb 11.2003 1:07 PM
Subject: LINESHARING FOR DSL IS IMPORTANT

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

Please support linesharing and TELRIC pricing

I am a Professor of Marketing at the largest Business school in the country (baruch College in New York City). We both know the weakness of the arguments to eliminate linesharing. Giving the Bells a monopoly, or ability to raise prices drastically, will be a catastrophe. Rates for broadband access would easily rise \$10 per month almost overnight. Innovation will slow or stop without competitive pressure.

The false argument of cable competition is transparent. A duopoly is no different than a monopoly. We cannot depend on market forces in a monopoly situation.

Please preserve TELRIC pricing and linesharing. It will mean billions of dollars to American consumers and small businesses.

Sincerely,
Charles Gengler, PhD
Baruch College
New York City

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Shopping - Send Flowers for Valentine's Day
<http://shopping.yahoo.com>

From: Christine W. Parker
To: Christine W. Parker
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 8:40 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Warner
Senator Allen
Representative Davis
Message text follows:

Christine W. Parker
PO Box 1
North, VA 23128

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Christine W. Parker

From: Clayton Munson
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 12:07 PM
Subject: UNE-P

isn't it time to give up the fight and do what's right for the citizens of the United States and keep UNE-P as it is??

MSN 8 with e-mail virus protection service: 2 months FREE'
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/virus>

From: Donald Buttermore
To: Donald Buttermore
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 8:36 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Warner

Senator Allen

Representative Davis

Message text follows:

Donald Buttermore
PO Box 1
North, VA 23128

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Donald L. Buttermore

From: Donna Lane
To: Donna Lane
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 1:43 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Lautenberg

Senator Corzine

Representative LoBiondo

Message text follows:

Donna Lane
P O. Box 1244
Millville, NJ 08332

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely.

Donna Lane

From: Eddie Gordon
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 6:16 PM
Subject: UNE

<<UNE-Platform Letter Michael Powell.doc>>

Eddie Gordon
Access One Inc.
820 West Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL. 60607
312-441-9902 voice
312-441-1010 fax
Visit: www.accessoneinc.com



February 5th, 2003

Dear Chairman Michael Powell:

I ask your support for the continued availability of the "UNE-Platform."

My company, Access One, offers local telephone service in the SBC territories. The company has achieved increasing success largely because it utilizes the combination of "unbundled network elements" – the UNE-Platform – to serve customers. It is absolutely critical that we have continued access to the UNE-Platform to remain competitive.

Unfortunately, the Regional Bell Operating Companies have launched a full-scale attack on the UNE-Platform, realizing it is a major threat to their continued market dominance. Their strategy is to impose certain restrictions on individual network elements that would destroy the competitive value of the UNE-Platform. If the RBOCs succeed, it will all but end any chance for consumers to enjoy the benefits of meaningful competition in local phone service.

Please oppose any effort at the Federal Communications Commission or at state agencies to limit the availability of the UNE-Platform. The UNE-Platform should be firmly and permanently established as a viable service option for competitive telecom carriers.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Edward Gordon
Access One Incorporated

From: FERGUSON, TERRI
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 9:49 AM
Subject: FCC vote on UNEP

> -----Original Message-----

> From: FERGUSON, TERRI
 > Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2003 8:50 AM
 > To: 'fccinfo@fcc.gov'
 > Subject: FCC vote on UNEP

>
 > For the health our nation's communication system, the majority of industry
 > employees
 > and shareholders I strongly urge FCC Commissioners to approve Chairman
 > Powell's
 > proposal to phase out UNEP under FCC control, not state regulators.
 > Private industry
 > should no longer be expected to subsidize other telecommunication
 > companies, both
 > large and small. CLECs have gone out of business and others still
 > operating collectively
 > owe RBOCs millions of dollars that will never be collected. Just as we
 > experienced with
 > homeowner insurance premiums here in Texas, the costs will ultimately have
 > to **be** passed
 > on to consumers. The current structure does NOT benefit consumers in the
 > long run as
 > it was designed to do. In fact, it does the opposite. It is false
 > competition that has
 > created of loss of over 500,000 jobs. and over \$1 trillion in shareholder
 > value. Let's stop
 > bad policy now, with the hands qualified to do the job -- THE FCC.
 >
 > Terri S. Ferguson
 > Financial Consultant
 > A. G. Edwards & Sons, Inc.
 > terri.ferguson@agedwards.com
 > www.agedwards.com/fc/terri.ferguson
 > 281 3746800
 > 800 388 5468
 >
 >

 Notice: Since e-mail messages sent between you and A.G. Edwards &
 Sons, Inc. ("AGE") and its employees are transmitted over the
 Internet, AGE cannot assure that such messages are secure. You
 should be careful in transmitting information to AGE that you
 consider confidential. If you are uncomfortable with such risks,
 you may decide not to use e-mail to communicate with AGE. Although
 you may be sending an e-mail message to a specific AGE employee,
 other AGE employees may review such messages. Additionally, your
 e-mail messages to AGE may, consistent with AGE's regulatory

requirements and retention policies, be retained. You should also be aware that e-mail messages may be delayed or undelivered. **AGE** does not accept orders to effect transactions or other similar instructions through e-mail messages.

From: FERGUSON. TERRI
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 9:52 AM
Subject: FCC vote on UNEP

> For the health our nation's communication system, the majority of
 > industry employees
 > and shareholders I strongly urge FCC Commissioners to approve Chairman
 > Powell's
 > proposal to phase out UNEP under FCC control, not state regulators.
 > Private industry
 > should no longer be expected to subsidize other telecommunication
 > companies, both
 > large and small. CLECs have gone out of business and others still
 > operating collectively
 > owe RBOCs millions of dollars that will never be collected. Just as we
 > experienced with
 > homeowner insurance premiums here in Texas, the costs will ultimately have
 > to be passed
 > on to consumers. The current structure does NOT benefit consumers in the
 > long run as
 > it was designed to do. In fact, it does the opposite. It **is** false
 > competition that has
 > created of loss of over 500,000 jobs, and over \$1 trillion in shareholder
 > value. Let's stop
 > bad policy now, with the hands qualified to do the job -- THE FCC.
 >
 > Terri S. Ferguson
 > Financial Consultant
 > A. G. Edwards & Sons, Inc.
 > terri.ferguson@agedwards.com
 > www.agedwards.com/fc/terri.ferguson
 > 281 374 6800
 > 800 388 5468
 >
 >

Notice: Since e-mail messages sent between you and A.G. Edwards & Sons, Inc. ("AGE") and its employees are transmitted over the Internet, AGE cannot assure that such messages are secure. You should be careful in transmitting information to AGE that you consider confidential. If you are uncomfortable with such risks, you may decide not to use e-mail to communicate with AGE. Although you may be sending an e-mail message to a specific AGE employee, other AGE employees may review such messages. Additionally, your e-mail messages **to AGE** may, consistent with AGE's regulatory requirements and retention policies, be retained. You should also be aware that e-mail messages may be delayed or undelivered. AGE does not accept orders to effect transactions or other similar instructions through e-mail messages.

From: George Issa
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 12:18 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

George Issa (issa.g@neu.edu) writes:

I mean honestly, you work for the AMERICAN PEOPLE, not VERIZON. BLS, Q and SBC! Don't you ever forget that. You better keep line sharing as it is today or you will be making a huge mistake!

Another day postponed! This **is** crazy. Your office at the FCC **is** bigger than my house that my brother, mother and myself share. IF you take away line sharing and I have only the bells as an option for DSL. they will be able to charge anything! THINK!!!!!!!!!!

Tell pretty boy Martin to do so as well.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.6.27.17
Remote IP address: 209.6.27.17

From: Gary A. Plunkett
To: Gary A. Plunkett
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 3:07 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Representative Burton

Message text follows:

Gary A. Plunkett
125 E. South St.
Shelbyville, IN 46176-2148

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here]

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Gary A. Plunkett

From: Gavin Mekemson
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 11:38 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Gavin Mekemson (gavin@4mcomm.com) writes:

Dear Commisioner Adelstein.

As the Triennial review rapidly approaches-

I recognize that there are many parties to satisfy. and therefore a healthy balance is key

Although it **is** an uncommon analogy, we can link the current UNE-P (de)regulation debate to what the natural world reminds us- if we dare to look.

Diversity **is** the key to existence. As biodiversity supplies checks and balances to maintain ecosystem integrity, diversity (competition) in the telecommunication sector maintains checks and balances necessary to sustain the "whole", allowing consumers a choice and small business the ability to get on their feet and possibly even flourish.

Please allow America to create a healthy and diverse telecommunications sector... a monoculture of control will ultimately lead to dis-ease of consumers and endangerment/extinction of small business.

As Americans, our patriotism is predicated on the terms of free enterprise and freedom of choice. With limited access to the UNE-P, small business and ultimately, millions of consumers, are limited and muted.

Thank you for your time,

Gavin Mekemson

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.68.240.240
Remote IP address: 64.68.240.240